2: Underhill E-5 (1931-1935)1939 NU28 Papago NU28



463 A specialist exercised his craft as his part of the family work and was excused from other labor. He supplied the family with as much 421 of his product as was needed, for use and gifts and the rest he traded 592 His product might be considered individual property in that no one but he had the right to dispose of it and that payment was made to him personally. But he gave the payment to the family just as the younger members gave their labor and if he gambled his products, he gave the family the winnings. Papago needs were such that the family unit required the full time labor of all its members and few thought of operating independently.

421 The family owned very little permanent property, the food which was obtained and consumed every year, constituting almost its 592 entire capital. Such other goods as they had were managed for the benefit of all by the heads of the two working groups: the patriarch for the men, his wife for the women. The patriarch directed the building of a new house or camp and traded when necessary for house posts or stone for tools. It was he who decided on gifts of agricultural produce or meat though he might consult with his wife. The wife managed the use of household mats, pots and baskets. When more were needed, she either had them made in the household or traded for them with womens' goods. She decided on the distributions of cooked food and the harvest from the womens' food gathering. Relics of this system can still be seen in the careful way in which the modern Papago family often separates "man's money" and "woman's money" the woman paying for household goods with her baskets and the man for his saddle with home made rope.

422 Since Kino's time, the Papago have begun to own cattle, at first [462] in the lands near Mexico, later in the north. Cattle are in charge of the men, like house building and agriculture and their care is directed by the family head. He usually delegates one of his sons as cowboy, just as in former times, one was the hunter. If there are few cattle, the one cowboy may take charge of the cattle of several related families who in turn give produce to his family but not to him personally unless they are very modern.

Each individual had, as his personal property, the scanty clothes he wore, the tools and weapons used and probably some paint and gambling sticks. The whole equipment could be carried on his back, as a girl's was when she went to her husband's house. But more important was ceremonial property: the shaman's plumes, the animal fetish of the curing singer, the eagle feathers, sea shells or Apache scalp won by the "ripe man". These were the most personal of all property for no one but the owner dared touch them —

4: Joseph et al D, E-5 (1942-1943) 1949
NU28 Papago NU28



morality, as indicated by the greater emphasis on character traits like kindness and friendliness rather than on the value of work. Seen together with these children's concern about aggression and other bad behavior and their frequent admissions of anger caused by experienced aggressions as revealed by the Emotional Response Test, this shifting of values suggests the rise of tensions and conflicts which cannot be effectively controlled by the action of work. 153 577

The children's answers directly reflect values taught by the missions, as well as disturbances of cultural and socioeconomic cohesion, as is manifest, for example, in the split between Catholic and Presbyterian Papago and in the increasing influence of individual wealth and prestige in a formerly uniform and levelized group (see chaps. vi and vii). 153 577 797

To the Papago, work was centered in and done for the family group. White standards of competition and individual achievement thus must seem to him—and probably are, in effect—in direct opposition to the central institution of his life. The individual who is being slowly deprived of the confident assurance that his world is unquestionably right, absolute, and eternal must then resort to other sources of security and accept other values and standards of behavior.

Christianity, as it has been presented to the eastern Papago for the last thirty years, has obviously become the most important new source of security. In the beginning it may have caused doubt and conflict, but today the Papago's serious and eager participation in mission services and institutions is ample evidence that here he finds security.

The Christian principles of peace, kindness, consideration for one's neighbor, and avoidance of aggression are familiar to the Papago, in whose culture these principles have long had a place. While previously they were devices with a social function, developed out of the needs of Papago family groups and communities and aimed toward their best possible maintenance, these principles are now presented as imperative moral demands of an absolute character, to be pursued by the individual independently of, and if necessary even against, actual requirements of the society. As the scope of these demands is not limited to the accomplishment of certain duties but extends to self-improvement and salvation, "goodness" and "badness" are now becoming the attributes not only of actions but also of thoughts, attitudes, and motives. Psychologically they imply a stronger development of personal conscience and of self-scrutiny and guilt feelings.

Whether and how far this pattern of changing behavior standards fits the changing total psychological and socioeconomic situation we shall see when dealing specifically with the problems of Papago adjustment to white American civilization. At this point a few words should be said about one unexpected 153 577 421

4: Joseph et al D, E-5 (1942-1943) 1949
NU28 Papago NU28



153 result obtained from the Moral Ideology Test in regard to the concept of
577 stealing.
421 In the old Papago society, stealing was ordinarily done by enemy raiders and did not constitute a problem within the society, for people in need were supported by their relatives. Even today stealing is extremely rare among the Papago. At the same time, we find from this test that there is a discrepancy between the attention given by Papago children to the value of personal property and the concern about stealing as a cause for blame. This trend is more pronounced in the more acculturated eastern districts than it is in the West.

Apparently we are dealing here with a one-sided, negative approach to the concept of property. The value of property beyond subsistence uses has been introduced into Papago society under more pressure than any other white concept. Its positive manifestations—such as the creation of jobs and the establishment of co-operatives for the sale of cattle and horses—have been less generally experienced than its more negative effects—the building of cattle guards between districts, the introduction of relief, and the emphasis laid in school and church upon the sanctity of personal property in the face of a society which, still largely co-operative, is only in the earliest stage of developing an individualistic, competitive system. Sanctions against taking someone else's property were imprinted upon the minds of the Papago before they were allowed to realize that they could acquire property for themselves by legitimate means.

From this point of view the attention given by Papago children to the concept of stealing seems largely a direct effect of a kind of indoctrination not uncommonly used in dealing with minorities. It is characterized by the introduction of new principles through a vanguard of restrictive rules which have no organic basis in the minority group's experience and are only slowly assimilated with opportunities for such experiences and for development of corresponding positive values. The psychological effect of this sort of indoctrination is demonstrated in the world of Papago adults by feuds between districts about grazing land; in that of their children, by bickerings about the ownership of pencils, hair ribbons, and candy sticks.

153 Of main interest to us is the conclusion from these findings that, where
577 values similar to those already existing in Papago society have been introduced from outside with comparatively little coercion, there is a certain equilibrium between the development of positive behavior standards and those of restrictive, negative significance—as, for example, between kindness, on the one hand, and avoidance of aggression, on the other. Where, under pressure from a differently oriented society new principles are encroaching upon the Papago, this equilibrium seems to be lacking; and the constructive, positive standards are outweighed by the negative.

5: Castetter & Bell N-5 (1938-1940 1942
NU28 Papago NU28
Pima NU29



Pi 428 If a Pima died, his land was theoretically inherited by his immediate family—the widow, sons and daughters; practically, it remained intact so long as the widow lived, the rest of the family caring for it with the eldest son in charge. At her death the land was divided among the sons (although an unmarried daughter could claim her share), since it was expected the husbands of married daughters would inherit or develop land of their own. However, if a daughter and her husband were not doing well a piece of land might be given them. Sons were regarded as being under the jurisdiction of the father until his death. Upon the death of both parents, leaving a single young son, a relative took over the care of both boy and land until he was old enough to assume the responsibility himself. Women might own land, but this ordinarily applied only to widows who had no male members in their immediate families to cultivate it, and in such case it was planted for them by the nearest relatives. This was noted by Grossmann[13] in 1873. If a man and his wife should leave no children, their land was divided among the nearest relatives of both.

Pi 423 A newcomer among the Pima found it difficult to secure land, his best opportunity being to farm a piece not being used at the time by the owner. Regardless of how long he used it, however, the original owner could claim it at any time as it was still his property. If a man left the district temporarily, a relative, never a newcomer, would assume its care during his absence; if he left permanently, a relative took over the land.

Pa 421 Underhill[14] has shown that the center of the Papago economic system was the patriarchal family, rather than the individual, and must be regarded as the unit of property holding and of the extensive system of exchange of goods by gift, the Papago equivalent for trade. Of property there was indeed little: apart from land and dwelling the food pro-

[13] Grossmann, *op. cit.*, p. 415.
[14] Underhill, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-4, 90, 94-7.

5: Castetter & Bell N-5 (1938-1940) 1942
NU28 Papago NU28



duced on the land constituted almost the entire family capital.421 An indication of spheres of authority is seen in that the husband disposed of gifts of meat and cultivated crops; the wife, of cooked food and wild crops. The chief interest of a family was in its land. An agricultural settlement, known as the Fields, had usually been discovered and settled by a family group, and was situated on a flat plain where a wash coming down from the mountain side spread its water over the level land for as much as a square mile or more. Here the group of relatives distributed the land among themselves under the direction of some man chosen as the leader, the allotments, if possible, being as much as two acres. Tillable land was to be found only in small patches, but each family had such a field. Brothers worked together under their father during his lifetime, often living in the same house and bringing their wives home to share it. On the death of the father, sons built for themselves separate houses, but often continued to share the land, and if the land were divided, it was done very informally and the brothers continued to act together in many ways as an economic unit. The eldest son sometimes farmed his father's land, or he might turn it over to a brother and develop a new plot himself. In some cases several sons kept their land together, one being the hunter, the others doing the farming. Under special circumstances a woman brought her husband to live in the family group, where he was placed on a par with the sons and given a piece of land, this being assigned to him and not his wife. However, it was rare for a Papago to live outside of his own village, except by intermarriage. Sons usually helped enlarge the father's field if land were available, and remained with him. But as the population of a family group increased, plots within walking distance might no longer be available and one of the younger men would move. Because of fear of enemies and the necessity for reciprocal help in cultivation, he often sought among his relatives for others who needed land, and together they would settle in a new and, if possible, adjacent area. No per-

5: Castetter & Bell N-5 (1938-1940 1942
NU28 Papago NU28
Pima NU29



Pa mission was needed to develop and farm a new piece of land.
NU There was no private ownership of wild plants on either cultivated or undeveloped land. In developing a new piece of ground, mesquite or sahuaro trees, because of their fruit, were never removed, but such trees were regarded as common property and any person might pick the fruit.

### Destruction of Property at Death

Pi Pa NU Unlike Mohave, the Pima, and especially Papago, could not afford to destroy all their property and goods on the occasion of death in the family; nevertheless, a considerable amount of Pima and Papago property was so destroyed. Usually the Papago house, excepting posts, was burned and most, if not all, of the individual's personal equipment buried with him. Cattle and crops, regarded as family property, were distributed among the children. Occasionally families died out, whereupon the Council, on request, reassigned their land. In the case of a number of successive deaths, the surviving members of a family group often deserted the land to prevent it, like the house, from being visited by ghosts. Since ghosts influenced only relatives, other persons might take over the land, but only by permission of the family, who always retained the right to reoccupy it if desired.[15] Our Pima informants asserted that in historic times when a man died and left a crop standing in the field, word was passed around to the neighbors to turn their horses into it. The reason was that the dead man's relatives wanted to see everything he possessed or had accomplished in his lifetime go with him. In this connection Grossmann[16] wrote, in 1871, that the Pima custom of destroying all the property of the husband at his death impoverished the widow and children.

[15] Underhill, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-1.
[16] Grossmann, *loc. cit.*